

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 8-14 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicants again respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge acceptance of the drawings and Applicants' claim for foreign priority in the next Office Action.

Claims 1-5 and 8-14 are all the claims pending in the application. These claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Murray (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,668). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

**A. The Office Action was Improperly Made Final.**

Applicants respectfully request that the application be passed to issue based on the remarks herein, or that this Office Action be made non-final. Specifically, in the February 11, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner cited sections of the Murray specification in rejecting claim 1 that broadly disclosed aspects of the Murray method, rather than specifically associating the features of Murray with the recited features of claim 1. For example, the Examiner stated that the plural display means recited in the claims of the present invention were disclosed at col. 5, lines 3-56, and Figs. 3-4 of Murray. In the May 6, 2004 Amendment, Applicants argued that this section of Murray provided only a brief mention of a display at line 65 without any suggestion of plural display means. Further, Applicants noted that the Examiner's reference to Figures 3 and 4 as disclosing this feature were also not persuasive since these Figures show only representations of browser screens associated with monitor 112.

In this Office Action, the Examiner provides new arguments (new grounds of rejection) alleging why the plural display means of the present invention are disclosed by Murray. In addition, along with these new arguments, the Examiner cites sections of Murray different than in the previous Office Action. Applicants should have been given the opportunity to respond to these new arguments in a non-Final Office Action.

**B. Murray Does Not Suggest Plural Display Means**

The Examiner states that the plural display means of the present invention are now disclosed at col. 4, lines 1-5, and col. 23-35 of Murray. The Examiner argues that “more than one Web pages can be displayed on the Web Browser” (see page 2 of the Office Action). In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action at page 8, the Examiner expands on these remarks stating that “Murray clearly teaches the ability of displaying more than one web pages/links/icons on a Web Browser ... means a plurality of display (Web pages) can be displayed on one screen. Applicants note that col. 4, lines 1-5 discloses:

“It is not necessary for each local computer 110 to be connected directly to the network 100. Rather, as long as these local systems are able to access the network and retrieve content such as Web pages, then they may also be connected to the network via a proxy or similar intermediate server” ; and col. 5, lines 23-25 discloses:

“A browser and/or electronic mail (e-mail) software module 242 is also included in each local processing system 110.”

Applicants submit that these sections only teach that the Murray computer is able to display a web page using a Browser, such as Internet Explorer (see col. 5, lines 34-36), and that no suggestion of plural display means is found.

Turning back to plural display means of the invention, this feature is associated in the claims with a display control means. The display control means displays the information “on selected ones of said plural display means on the basis of the detection result of the identification results.” As such, the display means of the present invention are selected. Murray is silent regarding plural display means as discussed, and accordingly placement of, for example, its identifiers on a chosen display screen. The Examiner cites col. 7, lines 1-5, col. 8, lines 33-67, col. 10, lines 20-57, and Figures 3 and 4 as disclosing this feature. However, these sections and Figures disclose only that the markers/identifiers are displayed along with the current page (see col. 7, lines 4-6); or that similarly, a marker is inserted into a viewed page (see col. 8, lines 41-44). There is nothing that suggests choosing a display screen based on the detection of the markers/identifiers. The Examiner’s reference to Figures 3 and 4 as disclosing this feature are also not persuasive since these Figures show only representations of browser screens associated with monitor 112. Finally, Applicants note that there does not have to be two separate physical displays on a single monitor, but that the claims should be interpreted broadly.


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Application No. 09/803,950

Attorney Docket No. Q63572

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Kimble  
Registration No. 44,186

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 23, 2004